

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,646	07/23/2003	Tiecheng A. Qiao	85505KNM	9727
75	90 01/12/2006		EXAM	INER
Paul A. Leipold			GROSS, CHRISTOPHER M	
Patent Legal Sta				
Eastman Kodak Company			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
343 State Street			1639	
Rochester, NY 14650-2201			DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/625,646	QIAO ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Christopher M. Gross	1639			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 October 2005</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 						
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen			(272			
2) Notice 3) Information	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) tr No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

1. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-22, drawn to a protein microarray, classifiable under DIG 22.
 - II. Claims 23-27, drawn to a method of making a substrate for fabrication of protein microarrays, classifiable under DIG 46.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product could be prepared by coating with prefabricated protein-collagen conjugates. Searching invention I with II would impose an undue administrative burden. Prior art searches of the product that is invention I and the method of making them are not coextensive: patent and non-patent literature databases would need to be queried for separate keywords and an in-depth analysis performed for the particular method steps of invention II which would not be necessary for the structure-based search of invention I.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each of the groups is not required for each of the other groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/625,646

Art Unit: 1639

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Page 3

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Election of Species

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Applicant is required to elect a **single type of protein array comprising:**an adhesive layer comprising gelatin (claims 9-16), a gelatin layer bearing a trifunctional "A-L-B" compound (Claims 17-22). Currently, claims 1, 9-22 are generic.

Application/Control Number: 10/625,646

Art Unit: 1639

The microarray of claim 1 wherein the adhesive interlayer comprises: proteins, protein derivatives, gelatin, gelatin derivatives or hydrophilic water-permeable colloids. Currently, claims 1 and 6 are generic.

The microarray of claim 1 wherein the adhesive interlayer layer comprises synthetic polymeric peptizers, carriers or binders. Currently claims 1 and 7 are generic.

The microarray of claim 1 wherein the adhesive interlayer layer copolymers comprises poly(vinyl alcohol), poly(vinyl lactams), acrylamide polymers, polyvinyl acetals, polymers of alkyl and sulfoalkyl acrylates and methacrylates, hydrolyzed polyvinyl acetates, polyamides, polyvinyl pyridine or methacrylamide. Currently claims 1 and 8 are generic.

The microarray of claim 10 wherein the organic solvent or mixture of solvents includes acetone, alcohol, ethyl acetate or methylene chloride. Currently claims 1,9,10,11 are generic.

The microarray of claim 17 wherein A is: aldehyde, epoxy, hydrazide, vinyl sulfone, succinimidyl ester, carbodiimide, maleimide, dithio, iodoacetyl, isocyanate, isothiocyanate or aziridine. Currently claims 17 and 21 are generic.

The microarray of claim 17 wherein B is: aldehyde, epoxy, hydrazide, vinyl sulfone, succinimidyl ester, carbodiimide, maleimide, dithio, iodoacetyl, isocyanate, isothiocyanate, or aziridine. Currently claims 17 and 21 are generic.

The method of claim 23 wherein the protein capture agent is an: antibody, protein scaffold, peptide, nucleic acid ligand or molecular imprinting polymer.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification

of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Page 5

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher M. Gross whose telephone number is (571)272-4446. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on (571)272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1639

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher M Gross

Mark 2 Ming

Examiner

Art Unit 1639

cg

Mark Shibuya Examiner

Art Unit 1639